

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 9281 of 1997

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE H.R.SHELAT

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

SURESHKUMAR KANCHHEDILAL JAIN....Petitioner.

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT & three others.....Respondents.

Appearance:

MR HR PRAJAPATI for Petitioner

Mr. U.R. Bhatt, AGP for Respondents Nos. 1 to 3

Mr. Sunil C. Patel, Addl. Central Govt. Standing

Counsel,for Respondent No. 4

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE H.R.SHELAT

Date of decision: 13/02/98

ORAL JUDGEMENT

By this application, the petitioner, who is the detenu, calls in question the legality and validity of the detention order dated 29th October 1997, passed by the District Magistrate, Ahmedabad, invoking his powers under Section 3 (2) of the Prevention of Black Marketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Act, 1980 (for short 'the Act').

2. The petitioner is a shop-keeper and deals in kerosene. He has to sell the kerosene to the card-holders every fortnight as per the norms fixed. The District Magistrate had the information that by adopting several mal-practices the petitioner was diverting the quota of kerosene else-where for profiteering motive. He

therefore carried out necessary inspection and found that the petitioner had not maintained the stock-patruk and even the bill books. He had not even maintained kaccha list of the sale made and not displayed the board showing the opening balance and the rate of kerosene. The stock on hand was not tallying with the last entry in the relevant records. The District Magistrate then found after further inquiry and recording some statements of the customers that the petitioner was not selling the kerosene to the people as per the schedule once in fortnight, but was supplying the same to others for profiteering motive, and thereby was encouraging black economy. To check the mal-practices adopted by the petitioner stern action was found necessary. The District Magistrate in the circumstances of the case found that detention of the petitioner was the only way out to check his mal-practices and black economy. The impugned order then came to be passed consequent upon which the petitioner has been arrested and at present he is under detention.

2. On several grounds, the order of detention is assailed, but at the time of hearing before me, both the parties confined to the only point namely representation having been not considered promptly harming petitioner's right. It may be stated that under Article 22 (5) of the Constitution of India, whenever such detention order is passed, the detenu has to be informed providing necessary documents and particulars so that he can make effective representation against the order passed. If he then makes the representation after the receipt thereof, the concerned authority has to deal with the same promptly and dispose the same of at his earliest as liberty of the citizen is put at the highest pedestal in the Constitution. Whenever without any trial a man is confined, the authority passing the order or receiving the representation, must be prompt in disposing of the representation but if there is undue delay the order of detention if passed has to be declared unconstitutional. At this stage, it is necessary to refer the decision of the Supreme Court rendered in the case of Raghavendra Singh vs. Superintendent, District Jail, Khanpur and others - AIR 1986 S.C. 356 wherein it is laid down that the representation must be dealt with promptly and disposed of without any undue delay. Till the same is disposed of without wasting the time, the same has to be attended to and final decision has to be passed. If the representation is received by one authority who is not supposed to deal with the same, his duty is to promptly send it to the concerned department or authority so that the said authority may after the receipt thereof

deal with the same promptly and dispose the same of at his earliest without wasting time. In the case before the Supreme Court, the representation was sent to the President's Secretariat, and the Prime Minister's Secretariat received the same on 19th March 1985; and thereafter it was sent to the Ministry of Home Affairs on 25th May 1985; the same was then dealt with on May 31, 1985. There was, therefore no delay so far as the Ministry of Home Affairs was concerned. But there was a delay in sending the representation from Prime Minister's Secretariat to the Ministry of Home Affairs. In that regard, it was argued before the Supreme Court that the representation should have been addressed to the Ministry of Home Affairs and not to the President or Prime Minister because the President or the Prime Minister receives thousands of memorandums or representations from every part of the country and therefore it was not expected to be dealt with as expeditiously as possible as they would be considered had the same been addressed to the appropriate ministry. Dealing with the contention, it is observed that, even if the representation is sent to the Prime Minister or the President, the same has to be sent to the concerned department for taking appropriate action. There may be some delay in sending the representation from one Secretariat to the concerned department or Ministry and in that case some allowance may be made for the time taken in forwarding the representation to the appropriate Ministry and even taking all such time-allowances if the representation is not dealt with promptly and no appropriate order at the earliest is passed, the detenu will be entitled to be set at liberty. It is also observed that even if the representation is addressed to the President or the Prime Minister, no fault can be found with the representation because the "Central Government" means the 'President' or the 'Prime Minister' and if the representation is addressed to the President or the Prime Minister, the same should be considered to be the representation properly addressed to the Central Government.

3. In view of such law made clear by the Supreme Court, the point about representation in this case raised if considered, the detention order cannot be maintained as the representation is not at all considered. Of course the Government has come forward with the say that the representation has not been received, but at at page 43, the Window-Slip of Speed-Post is produced which shows that the representation was despatched on 5th December 1997. It seems the petitioner did not receive the acknowledgment slip and therefore he inquired with the postal authority and the Deputy Manager, Speed-Post,

Ahmedabad replied on 27th December 1997 to the petitioner that the article despatched on 5th December 1997 was delivered to the addressee on 8-12-1997. The letter of the Deputy Manager, Speed-Post at Page 43 in clear terms negatives the submission made on behalf of the Government that such representation is not received at all. When on 8th December 1997 the representation was received, the same ought to have been considered at the earliest, but it is not considered uptill now and therefore there is inordinate delay in disposing of the representation. When that is the case, in view of the decision in Raghavendra Singh (Supra), the impugned detention order cannot be maintained and the continued detention must be held unconstitutional.

4. For the aforesaid reason, the present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 29th October 1997, being unconstitutional and illegal, is hereby set aside and the petitioner is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith if no longer required in any other case. Rule is accordingly made absolute.

.....